

Mark Twain

The Contemporary Reviews

Edited by
Louis J. Budd
Duke University



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK www.cup.cam.ac.uk
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA www.cup.org
10 Stamford Road, Oakleigh, Melbourne 3166, Australia
Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain

© Cambridge University Press 1999

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without
the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 1999

Printed in the United States of America
Typeface Sabon 9/11 pt. *System* MagnaType™ [AG]

A catalog record for this book is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Mark Twain : the contemporary reviews / edited by Louis J. Budd.

p. cm. — (The American critical archives ; 11)

Includes bibliographical references (p.) and index.

ISBN 0-521-39024-9 (hardback)

1. Twain, Mark, 1835–1910—Criticism and interpretation.

2. Humorous stories, American—History and criticism. I. Budd,

Louis J. II. Series.

PS1338.M298

1999

813'.4—dc21

98-38097

ISBN 0 521 39024 9 hardback

Contents

| | |
|--|---------|
| Series Editor's Preface | page ix |
| Acknowledgments | xi |
| Introduction | 1 |
| <i>The Celebrated Jumping Frog of Calaveras County, and Other Sketches</i> (1867) | 23 |
| <i>The Innocents Abroad, or The New Pilgrims' Progress</i> (1869) | 33 |
| <i>Mark Twain's (Burlesque) Autobiography and First Romance</i> (1871) | 91 |
| <i>Roughing It</i> (1872) | 97 |
| <i>A Curious Dream; and Other Sketches</i> (1872) | 111 |
| <i>The Gilded Age: A Tale of To-Day</i> (1873) | 115 |
| <i>Sketches, New and Old</i> (1875) | 147 |
| <i>The Adventures of Tom Sawyer</i> (1876) | 155 |
| <i>Mark Twain's Patent Self-Pasting Scrap Book</i> (1877) | 169 |
| <i>A True Story, and The Recent Carnival of Crime</i> (1877) | 173 |
| <i>Punch, Brothers, Punch! and Other Sketches</i> (1878) | 177 |
| <i>A Tramp Abroad</i> (1880) | 181 |
| <i>The Prince and the Pauper: A Tale for Young People of All Ages</i> (1881, 1882) | 197 |
| <i>The Stolen White Elephant Etc.</i> (1882) | 217 |
| <i>Life on the Mississippi</i> (1883) | 233 |
| <i>Adventures of Huckleberry Finn</i> (1884, 1885) | 257 |
| <i>A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court</i> (1889) | 281 |
| <i>Merry Tales</i> (1892) | 321 |
| <i>The American Claimant</i> (1892) | 327 |
| <i>The £1,000,000 Bank-Note and Other Stories</i> (1893) | 335 |
| <i>Tom Sawyer Abroad</i> (1894) | 341 |
| <i>Pudd'nhead Wilson: A Tale</i> (1894) | 357 |
| <i>The Tragedy of Pudd'nhead Wilson and The Comedy of Those Extraordinary Twins</i> (1894) | 365 |
| <i>Personal Recollections of Joan of Arc</i> (1896) | 375 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| <i>Tom Sawyer Abroad; Tom Sawyer, Detective; and Other Stories</i> (1896) | 409 |
| <i>Tom Sawyer, Detective and Other Tales</i> (1897) | 413 |
| <i>How to Tell a Story and Other Essays</i> (1897) | 423 |
| <i>More Tramps Abroad</i> (1897) | 431 |
| <i>Following the Equator</i> (1897) | 461 |
| <i>The Man That Corrupted Hadleyburg and Other Stories and</i> <i>Essays</i> (1900) | 483 |
| <i>The Man That Corrupted Hadleyburg and Other Stories and</i> <i>Sketches</i> (1900) | 495 |
| <i>A Double-Barrelled Detective Story</i> (1902) | 513 |
| <i>Extracts from Adam's Diary</i> (1904) | 529 |
| <i>A Dog's Tale</i> (1904) | 539 |
| <i>Editorial Wild Oats</i> (1905) | 543 |
| <i>King Leopold's Soliloquy</i> (1905, 1907) | 547 |
| <i>Eve's Diary</i> (1906) | 555 |
| <i>The \$30,000 Bequest and Other Stories</i> (1906) | 565 |
| <i>Christian Science</i> (1907) | 567 |
| <i>A Horse's Tale</i> (1907) | 585 |
| <i>Is Shakespeare Dead?</i> (1909) | 591 |
| <i>Extract from Captain Stormfield's Visit to Heaven</i> (1909) | 607 |
| <i>Mark Twain's Speeches</i> (1910) | 615 |
| <i>The Mysterious Stranger: A Romance</i> (1916) | 631 |
| <i>What Is Man? and Other Essays</i> (1917) | 643 |
| Index | 651 |

Introduction

I

Anybody who opens such a thick archive as this has to wonder if it will be worth the effort it demands. As late as the 1950s a confident approach—labeled reception theory or, more reassuringly for old-line scholars, *Rezeptionsforschung*—could override these doubts. But few literary historians today believe that assembling the reviews and essays an author’s contemporaries published about his or her work produces congruent proof of how, explicitly or tacitly, it was understood, was absorbed by its readers, who in turn reflected the ideals, prejudices, tastes, failures of awareness, and underlying worldview of their times. Even with the tedious searching of magazines, this was sociohistorical insight made too easy. Mark Twain himself liked to dismiss faith this transparent with, “I wish I could be that young again.” Nevertheless, “the concept of the ‘passive audience’” was “astonishingly long-lived.”¹ Perhaps because it had some cogency after all.

However, growing primarily out of projects to reconstruct the lived culture or, more ambitiously still, the multilevel “mind” of a past era, that is, its actual rather than its official ideology, close analysis punched through all easy diagrams, even before it began asserting the importance not just of female authors but of female readers. Nowadays no self-critical scholar extrapolates an encompassing era from its reception of books or authors. “The profession has few procedures for recovering—fewer still for analyzing—what audiences made of given texts; we hardly know who comprised the audiences for particular texts. Current theories of popular culture invite us to suppose, however, that these audiences, whoever they were, approached texts diversely, creatively, unpredictably.”² Although the theories behind procedure have exfoliated lately, nobody who has explored those audiences expects that they will fit into any neatly exhaustive pattern.

Reader-response theorists focus on the dialectic between a personality (abstracted somehow, whether as the “implied” or “informed” or “ideal” reader) and a text determined in various ways, sometimes as the product of the reader’s more than the author’s mind. Although the abstracted reader actually responds within a web of social and cultural values—some subconscious or internalized,

such theorists tend to stick to minute, even word-to-word engagement with a text. More relevantly to this archive, they tend to assume that a contemporary review says nothing worthwhile. Most forebodingly, muckrakers of “ideology” contend that reviewers as well as their readers were locked so totally into the dominant ideology that their judgments can serve only to demonstrate how captive they were when the most perceptive of authors themselves understood at best dimly what they were, in effect, saying.

Although the reviews reprinted here will not shake postmodernist absoluteness, they hold, if confronted on their own terms, surprises that can stimulate an interaction of present and past readings, perhaps even a rethinking of some current articles of faith. And when intention is reinstated as an author’s polestar, some of the reviews will prove directional or at least suggestive. Or more practically yet, for the eclectic critic willing to learn from any source, old or new, some of the reviews may prove brilliant still. “A reception history focused on good readings, good in the opinion of their time, is directly valuable to our own reading.”³

To get the most out of this archive its user should stay alert to the history of reviewing itself, just as its keenest practitioners were alert to both the professional and economic ambience in which they worked. As soon as the reviewing of current books began, so did controversy about its standards and influence. That contentious interplay—lively and steady after the middle of the eighteenth century—grew loud early in the next century along with the widening impact of several British quarterlies, which was made possible in turn by new technology, prosperity, and spreading literacy. Of course, most authors resent any commentary except high praise. On the other hand, many of the early reviewers felt called to educate authors on points of morality or aesthetics; increasingly, they felt called also to elevate public taste, to guide it toward authors who deserved popularity. Such reviewers were vigilant to reprimand those fellow critics too easily pleased and therefore complicit in lowering standards. Thomas Babington Macaulay’s demasking of a then-acclaimed poet stood long after 1830 as the model of corrective candor. In the United States, Edgar Allan Poe soon made puffery look just as contemptible while also glaringly provincial.

As newspapers came to depend always more on income from advertising, they strained always harder to build a huge readership. A difference in tone or focus developed between the columns of a sober-toned magazine and those of a daily paper, between a critic and a reviewer, particularly in the United States. Except for comic relief, the newspaper’s public were less interested in seeing authors reprimanded for falling short of high-culture standards than in finding out which book they could benefit from, through either cultural upgrading or just enjoyment. Furthermore, such readers were eager to know whether a book favored egalitarian values. While quick with irreverence toward elitists, workaday reviewers heaped superlatives on the books with whom their constituency felt the most comfortable. Authors, however, certainly including Mark Twain,

prized approval from the solemn magazines far above newspaper flattery, which nevertheless paid off best for books sold by subscription. This archive exhibits the conflicting signals that reviewers gave Twain, who of course had notoriously conflicted goals.

As academics finally developed a “field” of current literature, the importance of reviews, whether in a daily, weekly, or monthly “department” (of print), was doomed to erode. Meanwhile, a legion of professional reviewers tried to sort out the always growing number of books but started to look like drudges skimming the continuous batches.⁴ Their point of no return to prestige came after World War II, when the academics who had moved on to contemporary writers promoted the judging of literary values into an intricate, meticulous specialty. “Practical” criticism, that is, commentary treating a book as a humanistic experience for the “general reader,” now gets no respect or even notice on campuses. Recently a dissenting observer highlighted the imbalance in John Updike’s reputation.⁵ Although Updike’s fiction has attracted much analysis, his brilliant reviews are essentially ignored; the metacritics are puzzled that he should waste his genius that way. There is no outcry for another Macaulay to raise the extramural, public standards of taste or integrity; instead, relative to the output of books, far less reviewing gets done today. Moreover, with a few admirable exceptions, its outlets aim at brisk entertainment (tonight!) that continually “discovers” a new talent or trend.⁶ For this archive the crucial point is that disdain for reviewing as now either marginal or hyped seeps backward to cloud the lively and educative picture of how it functioned during Mark Twain’s career.

That career as a review-worthy author lasted more than forty years without any sizable wanings. Twain’s prominence, his unique gifts, and his high-wire balancing between profits and prestige make him the chief exhibit for two crucial processes. First, he exemplifies the sharpening interplay between the ideal of belles lettres as not only aesthetic but also moral tutelage and the economic needs of both author and publisher. Whereas hindsight perceives tensions of gender, class, and ethnicity,⁷ the guardians of formal culture—grouped too dismissively under the “genteel tradition”—worried primarily that the standards of “great” literature were toppling under a flood of aggressively marketed trash. A prominent librarian proposed a “Central Bureau” that would distribute ratings of quality for current novels, ratings that might actually be displayed on each copy.⁸ Although the subscription book trade, to which Twain had committed himself, suffered the demonstrable brunt of such worryment, its practical damage is hard to measure. For most magazines or newspapers that refused even to mention books sold door to door through a “prospectus,” we can merely guess whether they acted out of sociocultural duty or to pay back publishers and bookstores that bought regular advertising. In 1896 Twain himself finally shifted to a mainline firm (Harper Brothers). After that a researcher can count on finding reviews of his books in any likely source.

During the 1890s the influence of advertising grew too strong to ignore loftily. An American periodical reprinted this British requiem for fading integrity:

It is a thousand pities the habit of reviewing so many new books in the literary papers has become general. It is a trade thing. Were a literary paper to have no advertising columns, do you suppose it would review half the new books it does? Certainly not. It gets the books, and it gets the advertisements, and then it does the best it can for itself and its readers by distributing the former among its contributors with the request that they will make as lively “copy” as they can out of the materials thus provided them.⁹

No realistic reader of the *New York American* would wonder that Edwin Markham’s “Bookland” page had to leave the entire right-hand column for a regular ad from Harper Brothers. (We need not smirk today; we march in the same procession: “Reviewers are key links in a commercial chain which connects the modern producers of culture with its potential consumers.”¹⁰)

In short, we cannot measure the comparative impact of Twain’s books by the number of reviews. Honing the problem down further to honesty of judgment, another British man of letters mourned: “‘If,’ said an editor to me once, ‘I were to tell the truth, as forcibly as I could wish to do, about the books sent to me for review, in six months my proprietors would be in the bankruptcy court.’ It is in the power of the publisher to ruin any literary journal. There is probably not a single review in London which would survive the withdrawal of the publishers’ advertisements.”¹¹ The economic pressure or just lure grew as more publishers aimed for the best-seller, preferably guaranteed by the author’s name. But since public taste stays gloriously unpredictable, they showily launched more and more books, hoping for a direct hit with at least one. By the 1890s the review columns brimmed with accolades for novels that a literary historian in the 1990s—to borrow a putdown from Twain—“had not suspected of being in the world at all.” For us the challenge is to separate the coerced from the sincere and insight-sharing praises showered on Twain’s later books.

The second process that Twain’s career as review-worthy author brings into focus is the rise of the newspaper as competitor with the magazine as a bulletin board for cultural affairs. Actually, the process was intricate, fitting Charles Darwin’s wonderment as to how some form of life pushes into every niche. The magisterial British quarterlies were soon challenged by monthlies, then by weeklies along with a few bimonthlies. Especially in Great Britain, gradations stayed fairly stable within each category, with the *Spectator* and *Saturday Review* emerging as the most respected of the periodicals that covered “all the new books.” After the Civil War the United States experienced—Frank Luther Mott finds—a “mania for starting magazines” that only got worse as time went on. Searchers for reviews can neither feel sure of having found all sources nor get at all those that once existed. Aside from transatlantic differences in quality,

coverage, and later availability, analysts have to allow for reciprocal jealousies as well as clashes of national pride over, for instance, *Following the Equator* (not just *A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court*). Of course magazine editors, anxious about the surging newspapers, had steadily moved toward greater vivacity and up-to-dateness. But every weekly newspaper turned into a daily as soon as its circulation could support one. There was even a level above that, viable enough to attract fearless entrepreneurs: the daily with reputation and sales beyond its home city.

The strongest metropolitan dailies drove fiercely for top circulation by widening their lens. "Cultural journalism," that is, "information about books, performances, exhibitions, and similar matters, became as standard as the front-page news or editorial page."¹² If, on such matters, newspapers aimed at a socially and economically lower public than did the magazines, they also groped for an individual niche. The *London Telegraph* kept claiming and scrambling for the "largest circulation in the world," while the *London Morning Leader* catered to political conservatives and the well-to-do; *The Queen*; *The Lady's Newspaper and Court Chronicle* already gendered and classed itself through its title. In the United States the *New York Evening Post* austere embodied Manchester Liberalism, while the post-Greeley *Tribune* played to the self-image of the Republican Party. Raising the stakes Joseph Pulitzer let no loyalties or pieties slow down growth, and William Randolph Hearst turned urban populism into a mine shaft rather than a cross of gold, but the *Boston Evening Transcript* had long preferred to puff itself as the "most literary newspaper" in the United States. In short, we must consider the source of every review, remembering especially the differences between the magazines and the newspapers but also remembering that although we can cross-examine either sector financially, each had its believers in a mission to educate and, finer still, elevate its readers. Better than most of his peers, Twain understood and accepted these complexities.

The magazines naturally kept claiming the elevated ground. Or, instead, E. L. Godkin, founding editor of the *Nation*, called on the keepers of belletristic culture to return to it. In 1865 his first issue derided the "age of promiscuous and often silly admiration," the "usual and popular course of panegyric."¹³ In fact, the *Nation* did raise the level of reviewers in the United States by picking them for demonstrated competence. But newspapers worked harder and harder at marketing literary culture. In 1892 an essayist confronted the live question, "Does a book-review department pay a newspaper from a business standpoint?" The hopeful answer advised that the only kind "worth considering is a good [one,] calculated to bring a literary circulation and thence literary advertisements." Restated, however, the advice tilted revealingly: "Remember . . . that you are acting for publisher and public, and that, when you can benefit the former without violating your obligation to the latter, you should do so."¹⁴ Long acquainted with the *Atlanta Constitution* from the

inside, Joel Chandler Harris found that real-life practice depressed quality another way:

A very deplorable fact is that the great body of literary criticism is mainly perfunctory. This is not due to a lack of ability or to a lack of knowledge. It is due to the fact that most of it is from the pens of newspaper writers who have no time to elaborate their ideas. They are in a hurry, and what they write is hurried. Under these circumstances, it is not unnatural that they should take their cues from inadequate sources and give to the public opinions that are either conventional or that have no reasonable basis.¹⁵

As early as 1873 the preface for *The Gilded Age* jeered that the authors did “not expect that the critic will read the book before writing a notice of it.”

During the 1880s, reviewing, swelled by the “realism war” that W. D. Howells stirred up, had itself become an intensified subject of debate, and in 1899 John Burroughs would decide that the “criticism of criticism is one of the marked literary characteristics of the last ten or fifteen years.”¹⁶ Given comprehensive indexes, the magazinists’ side is now far easier to retrieve; furthermore, they argued louder because they were losing out, as H. H. Boyesen, then on the faculty of Columbia University, warned.¹⁷ The intelligentsia settled into a tone of rueful loftiness that distinguished between critics who crafted essays and drudges who churned out “the hasty reviews that fill the daily and weekly papers.” Henry James derided reviewing—“a practice that in general has nothing in common with the art of criticism”—for “its roaring routine,” its “periodicity of platitude and irrelevance,” and its “rough-and-ready” pacing; always diplomatic, Brander Matthews, after genuflecting to Sainte-Beuve, James Russell Lowell, and Matthew Arnold, did allow reviewing a “far humbler function . . . defined as the art of informing readers just what the latest volume is in kind, in character and in quality.”¹⁸ Ultimately, the eminent British author Walter Besant blamed not the “ignorant and prejudiced” drudge but the editor who “expects his reviewer to pronounce a judgment upon a dozen novels, every week”; another, retrospective judgment of the “hack review”—“dull, vapid, commonplace, and timidly cordial”—held that it had “crept over a new book very much as an inky spider creeps over a piece of paper.”¹⁹ Frank Norris, who felt unfairly bruised as a novelist, worked several angles—by professing sympathy for hacks who started in “with a brain already jaded, an interest so low as to be almost negligible, and with—as often as not—a mind besieged by a thousand other cares, responsibilities and projects [to cover] twenty books in sixty minutes”; by granting “exceptions” for the “great papers which devote whole supplements to the consideration of literary matters”; and by syndicating his essay.²⁰ The operative point here is that the scholarly essays on the “reception” of some novel that have merely balanced one review against another deserve their oblivion.

A true disbeliever has dismissed reviews as the farce of an inferior mind

passing judgment on its superior. More cheerfully, a German skeptic had diagnosed them as a “kind of infant malady, to which new-born books are more or less subject.” In response to my opening doubts, however, benefits can be claimed for this archive, which exhumes reviews between eighty and a hundred and thirty years old. First, it situates its users in a culture war that, while not unique to Twain, emerged starkly during his career as the business of publishing boomed within a quickly evolving, distinct era between the Civil War and World War I. Second, when the user considers the private as well as the socio-economic factors, the reviews become humanized into the opinions of fallible individuals who judged not under the cold light of eternity but in the heat of interplay with contemporaries like Twain, whom many of them had met or had heard perform. Third, users can experience these reviews personally. Even vengefully if they choose to make them “data for testing the acumen and catholicity of many individual critics; the book, *en revanche*, takes the measure of the critic.”²¹ More humanistically, we can take revenge on ourselves by acknowledging some dead critic as our superior or, less competitively, by learning from him (few female reviewers figure here). More happily still, we can enjoy the rapport of finding our responses anticipated long ago; Twain himself enjoyed trying to reach back and interact with his forebears. Finally, those users who want to proceed impersonally can practice what René Wellek urged as “Perspectivism,” or the principle that “we must be able to refer a work of art to the values of its own time and of all the periods subsequent to its own.”²² If the changing readings of a book accrete into its ongoing significance, then the contemporary reviews obviously make the starting point. At least several of Twain’s books have reached the status of a classic—which, moreover, people *do* read—and will long hold their still accreting significance.

II

More narrowly, users must wonder how well this archive helps to comprehend the reception of each of Twain’s books. Like many an artist, he could feel misunderstood and mistreated. Even when established as overwhelmingly popular, he could fume with cross-grained humor: “I believe that the trade of critic . . . is the most degraded of all trades. . . . It is the will of God that we must have critics, and missionaries, and Congressmen, and humorists, and we must bear the burden. . . . At the worst, criticism is nothing more than a crime.”²³ But he praised certain critics—Howells, above all—and certain judgments, declaring, perhaps most notably, that the *San Francisco Chronicle* “understands” the intention of *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. As all of his usable letters come into print, we will get more of his responses to interweave with this volume; his letters also give his ranking of specific magazines and newspapers. When intentionality recovers its salience for critics, they will learn also from a reviewer’s

presumptions about it for particular books. Twain's angry disagreement with those presumptions can likewise help.

Biographers will now have richer grounds for intuiting how Twain's inner reactions to the reviews played upon his decisions about what kind of book to produce next and how to shape it. Probably such reactions followed most strongly the most heavily reviewed books—*The Innocents Abroad*, *The Gilded Age*, *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer*, *The Prince and the Pauper*, *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*, *A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court*, *Personal Recollections of Joan of Arc*, *Following the Equator*, and some of the late collections. (For reasons already given, the number of reviews does not always correlate with popularity, especially for *Roughing It*.) The more reviews we find, the more dependable is the cross-section of opinion and, furthermore, the better is the chance of recovering a valuable analysis; surely some of our forebears had shrewder insight than the ever brash modernist can allow. A high correlation among which passages were quoted as outstandingly humorous will encourage theorists who keep hoping to codify criteria for humor. Partly because of merit, *The Innocents Abroad* ended up with the most reviews. Immersion in them helps one reexperience the freshness, spontaneity, irreverence (not always welcomed), and colloquiality that it radiated in 1869–70. Also, their diversity of praises already leads to recognizing that Twain captivated a spectrum of audiences through his dazzling range of personae.²⁴

Many a review underlines the contemporary relevances. Comparisons with other biographies reveal that his *Joan of Arc* is riding a wave of current interest; reviewers of the travel books keep remarking that Twain is at times swimming with some tide of attitudes. Reviews of *The Gilded Age* name the real-life models for secondary characters. (Incidentally, the *Hartford Courant* establishes a still unused point for determining the first state of the first impression.) For *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* the *Hartford Post* shows that a presumably backwoods touch—the undertaker whispering loudly that the dog had cornered a rat—had a recent local origin. No explicator or deconstructor of a Twain text should go on record without checking the reviews.

Two warnings apply more generally. First, the British and the American reviews should neither be intermingled casually nor considered apart. If Anglo-American interactions during the nineteenth century grew too complex to diagram, some attitudes emerge distinctly. British critics approached Twain as a New World personality—however differently that image affected each book after *The Innocents Abroad*. British critics as well as readers felt surprisingly positive about *A Tramp Abroad*, perhaps believing that it gored their European rivals rather than an Old World culture that included themselves. Although *A Connecticut Yankee* mostly aroused hostility, a few years later their reviews of *Pudd'nhead Wilson* “were in general more spacious, more thoughtful, and greater in number than the American,” in part because it was stocked in bookstores there rather than hawked by subscription.²⁵ By the time of *Following the*

Equator (published there as *More Tramps Abroad*) imperialist tensions and concern for the Commonwealth dominated the British reviews.

Often, in America, opinion was swayed by the cachet of Twain's popularity abroad. Favorable reviews were excerpted, even reprinted. As early as *The Jumping Frog* miscellany, the *Californian*, after quoting the *Saturday Review*—"that most critical of the London Reviews"—gloated that one of its own contributors had been "endorsed by such high authority." Filler paragraphs saluted Twain's triumphs in Britain as lecturer and after-dinner speaker, not just author. The *Springfield (Mass.) Republican* echoed the exulting in a Hartford newspaper that *The Prince and the Pauper*, which British reviewers did treat with surprising tolerance, had reached, along with Twain's other "recent writings," a "popularity that would a few years ago have been considered impossible for any American writer to attain in England."²⁶ Curiously, a Chicago newspaper declared before any reviews had appeared that "the best English critics had pronounced" that *Life on the Mississippi* was Twain's "best book."²⁷ When the Anglo-American alliance in global politics firmed up during the last phase of his career, British critics clearly disliked doing worse, when necessary, than damning with faint praise—an approach which was selectively magnified in the United States.

A second warning about perspective is that—contrary to the sweeping hostility or indifference sensed by the *Springfield Republican*—in the later 1860s the British, while accepting Longfellow or James Russell Lowell as their talented clones, grew eager to admire American humorists—"men from the wilds of the Far West," brimming with crude exoticism, nonconformity, and tangy dialects.²⁸ Twain shot ahead of Artemus Ward, who died in 1867; and now dim figures like Joaquin Miller and Bret Harte, who lived until 1902, gradually fell behind too. As Twain's image acquired dignity for Americans, however, they began to resent any condescension. Eventually, a leading Baptist minister and journalist objected that "our English cousins" were too quick to praise the "wild and gamy" as a "new sensation"; their taste for American humor was not "always as discriminating as it is hearty." For instance, they flattened Twain's quintessence into a flair for "exaggeration." "His broad humanity, his gift for seeing far below the surface of life, his subtle comprehension of human nature, and his realistic method, are but dimly apprehended by those Britons who go off in convulsions of laughter the moment his name is mentioned."²⁹ Actually, his image in Britain would deepen in solemnity soon, beginning with his lecture tour to pay off his debts as heroically as Sir Walter Scott.

Even so, a minority of British critics would always deprecate Twain as a Yankee corrupting their language, flouting their manners, and glorifying social irreverence. Adapting the same anxieties, a few American critics regularly agreed, starting with *The Innocents Abroad* and making their last brave stand with *Huckleberry Finn*—banned by the Concord, Massachusetts, Public Library. Soon after the Civil War, a Southerner had mourned a second defeat, this

time for belles lettres: “Mark Twain and Josh Billings and their publishers luxuriate in public patronage, and have representatives in every library while . . . you will not find a dozen copies of Bryant and Hawthorne in a day’s journey.” At risk was the entire Western heritage: “Make a quotation from Homer, Plato, Charron or Bacon the next time you are in a friend’s parlor, and see if you will not have a blank stare for your answer.” But “tell the story of how Bemis ran from the buffalo, or Scotty wanted his friend’s funeral preached, and a face lighted with interest greets you.”³⁰ Intriguingly for us today, this critic does not list any women among Twain’s lowbrow cohort or else as a finer standard for humor though “Fanny Fern” had steadily increased her readership over the past twenty years and “Samantha Allen,” ready to move up from the magazines to Twain’s own publisher, would soon sell hundreds of thousands of volumes. In the mainline discourse American humor was male. If Twain did attract many female readers this volume cannot be used to demonstrate that.

III

Because Twain had charged into fame so loudly and colorfully, even the reviews for *The Celebrated Jumping Frog of Calaveras County, and Other Sketches* were influenced by previous commentary. Eastern newspapers had led the rush to reprint its title story in 1865. Likewise, Twain’s paid “letters” about the *Quaker City* excursion that were reworked for *The Innocents Abroad* had attracted wide interest. Although Twain rather soon hoped that *Mark Twain’s (Burlesque) Autobiography and First Romance* could sink into oblivion, he had stirred up prepublication hoopla among his cronies in the press. He would gladly cooperate with reporters, then with magazinists; after all, he had also a career as a comic lecturer to promote. Concurrently, for every subsequent book, his publisher emphasized that its author was a best-seller and, just as the role was finding a name, a celebrity to boot. Between these peaks, the filler paragraphs in the newspapers and the longer items in magazines kept surveying his reputation, making it an always more resonant topic until his death. Cumulatively, each group of reviewers, therefore, was swayed not only by the success or relative failure of his preceding books but by the intervening commentary, or just news, sometimes distinctly visible in the latest criticism.³¹

That drumbeat of commentary between the reviews went beyond the human-interest journalism that swelled during the later nineteenth century. Among the newspaper wits, Twain served as both a source of anecdotes and a target of friendly attempts to compete with the master. Furthermore, he generated interesting controversies, whether through his skit at the dinner for John Greenleaf Whittier, the banning of *Huckleberry Finn*, or the complaint about nude drawings for *Eve’s Diary*. Three underlying motifs were distinctive. First, all sides in the culture war confronted the issue of paying serious attention to a humorist,

especially one so irreverent. Second, Twain's river-town origins, his showy house filled with company, and his prodigality dramatized the success story that Americans enjoyed hearing over and over. Third, because Twain could flaunt his Yankee qualities when abroad, Americans wanted to hear every drumroll of his triumphal parades, whether as prized guest of Victorian hostesses, around-the-world lecturer, the lion of imperial Vienna, or eventually, Doctor of Letters at Oxford University. When the magazines started to compile a ranking of live authors, first Twain's appearance on any list and then his ever grander perch caused diminishing surprise, although in 1898 some readers doubtless goggled when the *Critic* magazine's sedate "Lounger" (Jeannette Gilder), having asked, "Who are the four most famous of living authors?" asked next, "Are they not Mark Twain, Tolstoy, Zola, and Ruskin?" The "Lounger" even suggested that they ranked "in this order." Obviously, that passage would stick in the mind of any reviewer-to-be who saw it and who equated worldwide fame with merit.

All along, Twain would help himself with interviews and statements for the press. So his books were just bigger links in a chain of publicity. When he attained the dignity, while still active, of a collected edition, itself a newsworthy event with sidebars about the projected royalties, Harper Brothers pumped out superlatives about the backlist as well as the latest book. Naturally, in Twain's own best mode, the icon busters now and then took aim at him. But more often than any of his contemporaries, he could get off easy because the reviewer knew and liked him or else was charmed by the public persona deployed still more effectively outside the published books. Or the reviewer resonated with the background hum that stayed warmly approving. An established British critic, recognizing that the "great mass of criticism is delivered viva voce," would concede, "This spoken criticism is of far greater importance than printed criticism. It is repeated again and again, in all sorts of places, on hundreds of occasions, and cannot fail to make dints in people's minds, whereas the current printed criticism of the week runs lightly off the surface."³² At the middle level of written judgment, letters to the editor ordinarily weighed in on Twain's side; in any reckoning, they helped keep harried reviewers aware that Twain watchers liked to see his comet riding high.

After allowing for the debits of publishing by subscription, intriguing imbalances still appear between the number of reviews and a book's impact. For *The American Claimant* the notice of a reissue in 1897 could refer to "this well-known production" although the first edition, never listed in *Publisher's Weekly*, was issued almost silently because Twain's company was wobbling; more lamentably for us, his bankrupt company sent out no American copies of *Tom Sawyer Abroad*. Even in his flush times he vacillated about sowing review copies. In spite of the splendid coverage of *The Innocents Abroad*, he had insisted on holding them down for *Roughing It*. Later, growling that the "general press" almost "killed" *The Gilded Age*, he likewise held back with *A Tramp Abroad*. Body count aside, some reviews obviously had greater force

because of where they appeared or who wrote them; W. D. Howells, T. S. Perry, Andrew Lang, Brander Matthews, Walter Besant, or W. P. Trent reverberated further than somebody who did not rate a byline. Unlike today, newspapers and the short-item columns of the magazines commented on major reviews in other forums; in fact they did so more often concerning Twain's books than anybody else's. A more consequential practice, simply irrelevant now, was that some editors ignored the books—*Pudd'nhead Wilson* and *Joan of Arc*—that had run first as serials. They also tended to pass over collections of pieces previously published elsewhere, especially if their newspaper reviewed the monthly magazines in detail. Twain's books aside, before the 1890s reviews partly functioned as a filler for the expanding number of pages; so wars, elections, testimony in major or notorious trials, and even official reports pushed out material of lower priority.

Still, Twain's career had favoring twists too. Precise research has hunted out "well over a hundred contemporary comments" on *Huckleberry Finn* besides more than twenty reviews.³³ *Joan of Arc* benefited from the guessing about its concealed authorship—and from competing with other biographies if getting noticed is the top criterion. *Following the Equator* benefited from headlines about Twain's world tour and the death of a daughter and from rumors about his health and supposed poverty. His 1907 book *Christian Science*, which arrived trailing sparks over his previous essays on Mary Baker Eddy, had been ready since 1903 and may have finally been scheduled to capitalize on her front-page battle with her son over money. *A Horse's Tale* revived the awareness, which penetrated to a medical journal, that *A Dog's Tale* had crusaded for animal rights. *Is Shakespeare Dead?* was tied into a solemn, worldwide debate through the reviews, counteractive essays, and letters to the editor.

Cosmopolitan readers have already recognized that this archive basically presents American and British (and not even Canadian) reviews. But the savant who can master all the printed languages and cope with the expenses of covering the globe may not find much beyond the few thorough searches already on record.³⁴ In 1872 a young French critic irritated Twain with a 23-page essay that evaluated his oeuvre up through *Roughing It* and translated the jumping-frog story.³⁵ If Twain had foreseen that the French would pay him the least attention of all in western and central Europe, he might have felt more grateful. That critic raises a practical question: What is the time limit for considering a translation—and any review of it—as "contemporary" with the first edition? Still more problematic: How applicable are the reviews of a translation to the original text? That problem crowds all the harder as the other language stands further from English—Russian, for instance—and as illustrators—of *Huckleberry Finn*, eminently—redraw to suit the host culture.

The label of "contemporary" does not sort neatly all the English-language books either. Although later editions in Twain's lifetime, including the several sets of his "works," elicited interesting reviews, they do not qualify for reprint-

ing here. Yet obvious objections follow. Not until 1882 did Britain enjoy a fully illustrated edition of *The Innocents Abroad*; the several printings before then (one in two volumes, each with a different title) must have struck any reviewer quite differently from the American version; for Routledge in 1872, furthermore, Twain had toned down the brashness.³⁶ Beside lesser instances, *Pudd'n-head Wilson* later stands out because the British edition cut away “The Comedy of Those Extraordinary Twins,” and *More Tramps Abroad* differed substantially from *Following the Equator* (the last book Twain sold by subscription); for both works, therefore, this archive separates out the reviews. The shorter list by far would give the British printings that were highly similar (forget identical!) to the American before Twain signed on with Harper Brothers. Especially whenever the British printing dropped the illustrations, it lost the effect of a subscription book: bulk, showy binding but cheap paper, and plenty of engravings. The two-volume *Roughing It* from Routledge justifies the recent warning that “no edition . . . can claim to fulfill” Twain’s “intentions without including” the illustrations.³⁷ Likewise, Routledge’s tidy three-volume *Gilded Age* doubtless struck reviewers less bluntly than the picture-larded tome from the American Publishing Company. Later, on the other hand, the British printing—as early as *A Tramp Abroad*—sometimes had a catchier cover than the American one.

Because only the dogged literary historian recognizes some of the signed reviewers, endnotes might have pointed out here that, for example, on *Huckleberry Finn* T. S. Perry and Franklin Sanborn tower above all others except Joel Chandler Harris; if only because Twain counted on considerable royalties from Britain, he himself later treasured the verdict of Lang and Besant. The extent, if we knew it, to which Twain had socialized with an anonymous reviewer would affect our trust in him or her; but we certainly discount Moncure Conway’s enthusiasm over *Tom Sawyer* after learning that, friendship aside, he functioned as a paid agent for the British edition. A rating scale of impartiality for magazines would also help well beyond the bottom ranking for house organs trying to sound judicious within the Harper web. In the open market, many of the magazines that carried reviews catered to some sociocultural constituency, and British magazines targeted still narrower subpublics. Although British editors fancied themselves as more impersonal than their American counterparts, Twain managed to exert his magnetism on both sides of the Atlantic and in diverse milieus.

Increasingly tuned to nonprint journalism, we forget the once self-conscious distinctiveness among the dailies in New York City (with Boston as the next liveliest arena). The *Evening Post*, directed by William Cullen Bryant for forty-nine years, insisted that it set the standard for integrity; Charles Dana’s *Sun* claimed to please the intellectually robust, although the pre-Pulitzer *World* competed for that role; all three, along with the Republican party-line *Tribune*, anxiously deplored W. G. Bennett’s glitzier *Herald*. Twain nevertheless man-

aged to cultivate the whole spread while being chummiest with the *Tribune* before he overreached there.³⁸ When the battle for circulation intensified during the 1890s, his leverage through friendships weakened, but to the end of his career the newspaper world—including the Hearst tabloids—treated him with comradely care. At his exit interview, he should have thanked God for creating critics and for making reviewers so approachable.

Now for the fine print of “Warning for Use”: Even with “contemporary reviews” in the ordinary sense, boundaries start dissolving. Fillers based on the “prospectus” carried by the agents for subscriptions posed as an opinion, and ostensible reviews that retreaded the prepublication handouts started with the *Jumping Frog* volume. If the *Literary Era* gave credit in 1894 when it reprinted a “Publisher’s Note,” Frank Norris would still charge in 1903 that the overworked hack grabbed at any crutch. In the 1870s and 1880s, newspapers saved effort another way by printing long “extracts” without commenting judgmentally. These excerpts swayed future readers, maybe more than feeble reviews; while *Roughing It* was getting few reviews, more newspapers quoted excerpts and helped its quick rise to fame. The long sections from *Tom Sawyer* that Conway supplied to a Cincinnati daily turned up across the country.³⁹ Twain and his publisher evidently favored promoting *A Tramp Abroad* through choice excerpts; on the weekend that *A Connecticut Yankee* was scheduled to come out, the *New York Morning Journal* and the *Hartford Courant* quoted from it at great length, surely with help from the publisher (Twain himself). After the Harper firm took over Twain, its advertisements supplied quotable puffs, suggested key adjectives, and recycled early accolades. Finally, postreview stories on sales or just another human-interest angle (so sinuous with Twain as to defy a geometer) continued to shape contemporary opinion.

The simpler focus on “books” also turns blurred, worst of all with the reviews of preceding serials. *Pudd’nhead Wilson* drew much commentary during its run in the still dominant *Century Magazine*—“as much attention as any of last year’s serials except *Trilby*,” according to the *Springfield Republican*, which decided “not to speak at length” about the book, also upstaged partly by acclaim for the play already based on it. The serials of *Joan of Arc* and *Tom Sawyer, Detective* drew so much commentary that some reviewers treated the eventual books as encores. Furthermore, the serials brought their own prepublication commentary; the *Springfield Republican* announced that Twain “will revive his most successful character, Tom Sawyer, in a serial,” *Tom Sawyer, Detective*. From the “first chapters” of *Pudd’nhead Wilson* the *American Review of Reviews* predicted that it would lead up to “some healthy moral concerning the race problem.”

Some of Twain’s books—mostly slim, paperbound clutches of his short pieces—evidently slipped clear through the reviewing net because they were in his case truly too numerous rather than “too humorous to mention”; at least six titles during the 1870s alone left no trail even as the attention given him grew

steadily otherwise. Those newspapers that reviewed the major periodicals of course featured the Twain items; so when a sizable book gathered tales, sketches, or essays the reviewer often skimmed past as “well known” those that intrigue us today; the prime examples are “A True Story,” “The Facts Concerning the Recent Carnival of Crime in Connecticut,” and later “The Man That Corrupted Hadleyburg.” Silences can speak meaningfully yet not hostilely in the record of Twain’s literary reception.

Since Twain was a Big Bang all by himself, this archive could keep expanding. His *Library of Humor* naturally aroused some interest in 1888, as did a second one more weakly in 1906. Several newspapers noticed the inept *New Guide of the Conversation in Portuguese and English* (1883) because of his “Introduction” or the reprinting of *English as She Is Taught* (1887) that had added his earlier review of it. Scanning the huge Clemens section of Jacob Blanck’s *Bibliography of American Literature* will point to other items some column of literary chitchat touched on. A survey of the critical commentary on Twain comes to resemble his map of the Nevada Territory in which the too numerous toll roads dangle over the edges. Ultimately, sheer practicality has to decide: good enough for now.

But acknowledging gaps and uncertainties does not mean joining those minds who launch a barrage of fresh questions after every discovery, who would continue defining a problem indefinitely: “Among intellectuals, after all, to say that something is more complicated than it appears is a truism to which all assent. Complexity makes work for intellectuals, and that life is almost always more complex than our analytic categories permit us to comprehend is no doubt true, but not in itself a devastating critique of those categories.”⁴⁰ The reviews gathered here did matter significantly. Besides their impact on Twain’s self-image, as well as his income, they guided his sense of how successfully he was connecting with his public. For that public they weighed on the decision whether to read his new book rather than look to other sources of mental challenge or entertainment that were multiplying at every level. For us they make Twain, his writings, and his times more accessible.

IV

This introduction does not give a running survey of Twain’s literary reputation, because it cannot proclaim any major surprises outside the pattern sketched by biographers aware of how crucial popularity was to his career and how constantly he monitored it.⁴¹ For now this archive steers the emphasis back toward the individual books. After the utopian day when research has run down all the contemporary reviews, some brave scholar-critic will try for an exhaustive analysis. Before then, diligent, patient work will have dug out the identity and intellectual slant of many still anonymous reviewers and will have traced the

underlying agendas, which often kept shifting, of the newspapers and magazines for which they wrote. That scholar-critic who achieves the crowning synthesis would benefit immensely from a history of book reviewing. So far, because of our long familiarity with it as a part of the publishing cycle, nobody has tried to establish how and why reviewers usually operated as part-time professionals.⁴²

Meanwhile, several of Twain's books keep getting reviewed. A biographer of H. L. Mencken concluded that "if we are to measure literary success by original manuscripts published, impassioned reviews inspired, and controversy sparked . . . not since Mark Twain, perhaps, has an American writer had a more notable, some would say, notorious, posthumous career."⁴³ Most obviously, judgments of *Huckleberry Finn* were rising in number and passion even before the missing part of the holograph manuscript restoked the fire in 1996.⁴⁴ Returning almost to Twain's beginnings, after PBS showed a version of *The Innocents Abroad* in 1982 a new wave of critics skirmished over the book. And returning to the origins of reviewing itself, the National Book Critics Circle is again striving to clarify self-awareness and standards for integrity.⁴⁵

A Note on Editing and Selections

The editing of this archive is light-handed. But because nineteenth-century newspapers checked galley proofs less carefully than now, typographical errors too often clouded spelling or meaning, and so I have corrected them silently. I have also corrected obviously careless versions of titles of books or names of characters or even the primary text. (When the *New York Tribune* made the "Prefatory" for *Roughing It* declare that "information appears to stew out of me naturally, like the precious attar of roses out of the otter," it may have meant to help the reader, but I doubt that.) I have not normalized spelling, however, nor have I corrected errors in titles and names when they might help indicate the degree to which the reviewer was (or was not) honestly knowledgeable about the text or Twain's other writing.

Reviews I could not manage to see are listed (and noted properly) in the hope that somebody else can recover them. I should have left space to jot in later discoveries; surely *Sketches, New and Old*, for example, was reviewed more often than this volume records. Evidently, except for a brief time in 1901–2 when Twain was attacking warily as an antiimperialist, he did not subscribe to a bureau that clipped newspaper items about him or his books. I will be happy to correspond with anybody about my searching—either to help develop leads or help avoid replicating zero results.

This archive did not have space for all the known reviews. Still, it opted for essentially complete texts despite some repetition in plot summary or other content. Because users presumably would approve, choice among the available

reviews favored the major books. Nevertheless, I have been careful not to favor the magazines over the newspapers. To do so would distort the shape and shaping of Twain's literary reputation during his lifetime.

Giving the newspapers their deserved weight intensifies the problem of what to demote to the "Checklist of Additional Reviews." Negative criteria were the easiest to apply: insipid summary; superficiality; signs of cribbing, either from preceding reviewers or a publisher's handouts; or incompetence that demonstrably misstated Twain's intentions. After the obvious culls, limited space made positive criteria necessary. First, some reviews, in my judgment, were clearly more perceptive; others demonstrated affinity with Twain's mind and its inextricable sense of humor. Second, still more subjectively, I chose reviews especially interesting today, whether as cogent for our current approaches or as surprisingly different somehow from what we expect. Finally, the plan for American Critical Archives emphasizes representative qualities; so I also favored reviews that expressed consensual attitudes. (Of course, if reprinted they tend to become self-validating on this count.) More broadly, I tried to understand "representative" as the coming closer than other reviews to embodying the zeitgeist that "reception" theory believes it can reenter.

But, ultimately, readers themselves will once again form their own opinions about Twain's reviewers. That's the point of reprinting the primary documents.

Notes

- 1 Robert D. Hume, "Texts within Contexts: Notes Toward a Historical Method," *Philological Quarterly*, 71 (Winter 1992), 80. A discriminating and complex exploration of the reader-response school of metracriticism, with which I agree, comes in the first two chapters of Janet Staiger, *Interpreting Films* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Univ. Press, 1992).
- 2 Nina Baym, review of Richard H. Brodhead, *Cultures of Letters; in American Literature*, 66 (March 1994), 170.
- 3 After questioning the fruitfulness of schematic approaches to literature, David Perkins comes to this conclusion in "Some Prospects for Literary History," *Modern Language Quarterly*, 54 (March 1993), 139. The ultimate baseline here is Frank Donoghue's complexly argued *The Fame Machine: Book Reviewing and Eighteenth-Century Literary Careers* (Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press, 1996).
- 4 See, for example, Virginia Woolf, "Reviewing," written in 1939, printed in *The Captain's Deathbed and Other Essays* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1950). Morris Dickstein, *Double Agent: The Critic and Society* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1992), p. 56, quotes from a similar essay by George Orwell. As early as 1885 a scholarly critic dismissed reviewing as the "sifting of production" by "book-tasters"—Richard G. Moulton, *Shakespeare as Dramatic Artist* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2nd ed., 1888), p. 5.
- 5 See James A. Schiff, "Updike Ignored: The Contemporary Independent Critic," *American Literature*, 67 (Sept. 1995), 531–52. An earlier, broader discussion of the

- developing pattern is Henry Hazlitt, *The Anatomy of Criticism: A Trilogy* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1933).
- 6 Dickstein, *Double Agent*, p. 57, makes this point effectively.
 - 7 Daniel H. Borus, *Writing Realism* (Chapel Hill: Univ. Of North Carolina Press, 1989), sensitively develops these themes in his chapter “The Passive Reader and the Celebrated Author.” The larger pattern of the pull between belles lettres and marketability has been discussed often; Raymond Jackson Wilson, *Figures of Speech: American Writers and the Literary Marketplace from Benjamin Franklin to Emily Dickinson* (New York: Knopf, 1989), grounds this pattern in the antebellum decades while demonstrating many complexities within the simple duality. As meta-critical approaches foliate, this pull, familiar to Twain biographers, has attracted intricate, polysided analysis—most recently in Richard Lowry’s “*Littery Man*”: *Mark Twain and Modern Authorship* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1996), which sets out to “read his writing as participating in a tension-fraught, even contradictory dialogue with readers, other writers, with the public in general and with Twain himself over the place of fiction in social life” (p. 11).
 - 8 George Iles, “Trustworthy Guides to Books,” *World’s Work*, I (April 1901), 585–7. Iles presented a far more detailed plan at a conference of the American Library Association—“The Trusteeship of Literature,” *Library Journal*, 26 (1901), 16–22. For a very early, vehement American statement of self-appointed responsibility, see “The Reviewer as Executioner,” pp. 176–8, in *The Federalist Literary Mind*, ed. Lewis P. Simpson (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State Univ. Press, 1962). John Tebbel, *A History of Book Publishing in the United States* (New York: Bowker, 1975), 2:41–2, 151–3, gives a broad perspective on reviewing as part of the book-selling process, on its underside (especially in its antebellum phase), and on its eroding impact at the end of the nineteenth century.
 - 9 *Literary Era*, 1 (March 1894) [45]; quoted from Augustine Birrell’s “Authors and Critics” in his *Essays About Men, Women, and Books* (New York: Scribner’s 1894). John Tebbel discusses the 1890s in *Between Covers: The Rise and Transformation of Book Publishing in America* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1987), pp 174–5.
 - 10 Dickstein, p. 56.
 - 11 John Churton Collins, “The Present Functions of Criticism,” in his *Ephemera Critica or Plain Truths about Current Literature* (Westminster: Constable, 1901), p. 23. Of course, it is hard to distinguish between actuality and a myth of weakened authority since the 1880s when, supposedly, “reviews, for almost every publication, were copious and lengthy” and were “taken seriously”—Denis Mackail, *Barrie: The Story of J.M.B.* (New York: Scribner’s, 1951), p. 103.
 - 12 See Dickstein’s chapter “Journalism as Criticism.”
 - 13 See Frank Luther Mott, *A History of American Magazines 1865–1885* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1938), pp. 232–3, 334–5, 338–9. In the earlier 1860s the weekly *Round Table* had campaigned for a “higher style of criticism” that ignored “pecuniary regard for advertisers”; see the essay by Robert J. Scholnick in *Periodical Literature in Nineteenth-Century America*, ed. Kenneth M. Price and Susan Belasco Smith (Charlottesville: Univ. Press of Virginia, 1995), pp. 170–4.
 - 14 “Book Reviews and Reviewing,” *Belford’s Monthly*, 8 (May 1892), 406–10.

- 15 "Huckleberry Finn and His Critics," *Atlanta Constitution*, 26 May 1885, p. 4. Although the editorial is unsigned, scholars accept Harris as the author.
- 16 Quoted in Frank Luther Mott, *A History of American Magazines 1885–1905* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1957), p. 121.
- 17 H. H. Boyesen, *Literary and Social Silhouettes* (New York: Harper, 1894), pp. 112–15.
- 18 "The Science of Criticism" (1891), in Henry James, *Literary Criticism*, ed. Leon Edel (New York: Library of America, 1984), 1: 95–9; Brander Matthews, "Criticism and Book-Reviewing," *Cosmopolitan Magazine*, 33 (May 1902), 89–95. Frank Swinnerton's lecture *The Reviewing and Criticism of Books* (London: J. M. Dent, 1939) starts off with a clear split "between criticism and reviewing"; later he comments in detail on some reviewers of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (pp. 26–8).
- 19 *Autobiography of Sir Walter Besant* (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1902), pp. 192–3; Swinnerton, p. 24.
- 20 "Newspaper Criticism and American Fiction," syndicated 9 March 1903; rpt. in *The Literary Criticism of Frank Norris*, ed. Donald Pizer (Austin: Univ. of Texas Press, 1964), pp. 153–5.
- 21 Frederick Thomas Blanchard, "The Study of the Fame of an Author," in *Dictionary of World Literature*, ed. Joseph T. Shipley (New York: Philosophical Library, rev. ed., 1953), p.156.
- 22 René Wellek and Austin Warren, *Theory of Literature* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1949), p. 35.
- 23 "Chapters from My Autobiography," *North American Review*, 183 (19 Oct. 1906), 707–8. Unfortunately, when invited to comment publicly, Twain, distracted by personal troubles, responded, "I suppose I *ought* to take an interest in this subject, but really I don't." Quoted in George Sands Goodwin, "Certain Authors' Views on Book-Reviewing," *Critic*, 40 (June 1902), 537–40. Goodwin followed up in the *Critic* with "Publishers' Views on Book Reviewing" and then "Views of Reviewers on Reviewing."
- 24 Indispensable to any discussion of *The Innocents Abroad*, including the reviews and Twain's reactions to them, is Robert H. Hirst, "The Making of *The Innocents Abroad*," diss. Univ. of California, Berkeley, 1975.
- 25 Frederick Anderson, "Introduction" to facsimile of 1st ed. of *Pudd'nhead Wilson and Those Extraordinary Twins* (San Francisco: Chandler, 1968), p. xxiii.
- 26 "Notes and News," 5 June 1882, p. 8. Actually, Clarence Gohdes, *American Literature in Nineteenth-Century England* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1944), would demolish the myth of British inhospitality to American writers before Twain.
- 27 "Literary Notes," *Chicago Inter Ocean*, 26 May 1883, p. 10.
- 28 Gohdes, *American Literature in Nineteenth-Century England*, pp. 89–94, remains the best analysis of this point.
- 29 Henry C. Vedder, "Mark Twain," in *American Writers of Today* (New York: Silver, Burdett, 1894), pp. 136–8.
- 30 Mortimer F. Taylor, "The Turning-Point in American Literature," *Southern Magazine*, 4 (Sept. 1872), 324–5.

- 31 Of attempts to document Twain's reputation, the volume that casts the widest net is *Critical Essays on Mark Twain, 1867–1910*, ed. Louis J. Budd (Boston: G. K. Hall, 1982); Budd's *Our Mark Twain: The Making of His Public Personality* (Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 1983) attempts more analysis. Both of these works depend heavily on the material in Thomas A. Tenney, *Mark Twain: A Reference Guide* (Boston: G. K. Hall, 1977)—with annual supplements published from 1977 to 1983 in *American Literary Realism, 1870–1910*. Daniel Wells, "An Annotated Checklist of Twain Allusions in *Harper's Monthly*, 1850–1900," *American Literary Realism, 1870–1910*, 17 (Spring 1984), 116–23, is exemplary as pinpoint tracking.
- 32 Birrell, *Essays about Men, Women and Books*, pp. 216–17.
- 33 Victor Fischer, "Huck Finn Reviewed: The Reception of *Huckleberry Finn* in the United States, 1885–1897," *American Literary Realism, 1870–1910*, 16 (Spring 1983), 1–57.
- 34 J. G. Riewald and J. Bakker, *The Critical Reception of American Literature in the Netherlands 1824–1900: A Documentary Conspectus from Contemporary Periodicals* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1982), surveys the projects in languages other than English that would necessarily include Twain; it is exhaustive for the Netherlands. See also J. C. B. Kinch, *Mark Twain's German Critical Reception, 1875–1986: An Annotated Bibliography* (New York: Greenwood, 1989).
- 35 Th. Bentzon (Marie-Thérèse Blanc), "Les Humoristes américains: I. Mark Twain," *Revue des Deux Mondes*, C, 2e période (15 July 1872), 313–35. This critic was so little known that even the *British Academy*, 3 (1 Aug. 1872), 283, erred when dissenting that "he exaggerates the popularity of his author, while expressing surprise at its extent." For helpful perspectives, see Mark K. Wilson, "Mr. Clemens and Madame Blanc: Mark Twain's First French Critic," *American Literature*, 45 (Jan. 1974), 537–56.
- 36 Dennis Welland, *Mark Twain in England* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1978), pp. 232–8, lists the Hotten and the Chatto & Windus printings. Here and elsewhere the section on Clemens in Jacob Blanck, comp., *Bibliography of American Literature*, vol. 2 (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1957), is useful. More specifically useful is Welland's "Samuel Clemens and His English Publishers: Bibliographical and Editorial Problems," in *Art and Error: Modern Textual Editing*, ed. Ronald Gottesman and Scott Bennett (Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press, 1970), pp. 167–85.
- 37 "Introduction," *Roughing It*, eds. Harriet Elinor Smith and Edgar Marquess Branch (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1993), p. 899.
- 38 Bryant Morey French, *Mark Twain and "The Gilded Age"* (Dallas: Southern Methodist Univ. Press, 1966), pp. 11–21, details the interplay concerning one early novel. French also discusses other reviews.
- 39 "Introduction," *Critical Essays on "The Adventures of Tom Sawyer"*, ed. Gary Scharnhorst (New York: G. K. Hall, 1993), p. 2.
- 40 Bennett M. Berger, *An Essay on Culture: Symbolic Structure and Social Structure* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 1995), p. 47.
- 41 Everett Emerson, *The Authentic Mark Twain: A Literary Biography of Samuel L. Clemens* (Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 1985) best combines the pri-